

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

ANDRE COLAVITO EVANS §
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10cv676
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID §

**MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Petitioner Andre Colavito Evans, proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Earl S. Hines, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and applicable orders of this Court. The Magistrate Judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge concerning this matter. The Magistrate Judge recommends the petition be dismissed without prejudice as moot.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record and pleadings. Petitioner filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the objections. Petitioner asserts that his petition should not be dismissed as untimely, but does not contest the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that his petition is moot. As the objections are not responsive to the Report and Recommendation, they are without merit. The court notes that as petitioner states he disagrees with the "Report and Recommendation of timeliness of filing," he appears to actually be responding to the answer filed by the respondent asserting that the petition should be dismissed as barred by the applicable statute of limitations. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the copy of the Report and Recommendation sent to petitioner was returned to the court with a notation stating petitioner was no longer at the address provided to the court, indicating petitioner never received the Report and Recommendation. As petitioner has not provided the court with a

current address, this petition will alternatively be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (*per curiam*) (*pro se* litigant's case dismissed for failure to prosecute when he failed to keep the court apprised of his current address).

ORDER

Accordingly, petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the court. A final judgment shall be entered in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See U.S.C. § 2253*. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not demonstrate that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues raised in the petition are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. If the court dismissed the petition on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the petition raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. Any doubt regarding granting a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason, or that a procedural ruling was incorrect. The factual

and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **26** day of **April, 2012**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge